

Phase Diagram for the Hofstadter butterfly and integer quantum Hall effect in three dimensions

M. Koshino, H. Aoki

Department of Physics, University of Tokyo, Hongo, Tokyo 113-0033, Japan

T. Osada

Institute for Solid State Physics, University of Tokyo, Kashiwa, Chiba 277-8581, Japan

K. Kuroki

Department of Applied Physics and Chemistry, University of Electro-Communications, Chofu, Tokyo 182-8585, Japan

S. Kagoshima

Department of Basic Science, University of Tokyo, Komaba, Tokyo 153-8902, Japan

(February 1, 2008)

We give a perspective on the Hofstadter butterfly (fractal energy spectrum in magnetic fields), which we have shown to arise specifically in three-dimensional(3D) systems in our previous work. (i) We first obtain the ‘phase diagram’ on a parameter space of the transfer energies and the magnetic field for the appearance of Hofstadter’s butterfly spectrum in anisotropic crystals in 3D. (ii) We show that the orientation of the external magnetic field can be arbitrary to have the 3D butterfly. (iii) We show that the butterfly is beyond the semiclassical description. (iv) The required magnetic field for a representative organic metal is estimated to be modest (~ 40 T) if we adopt higher Landau levels for the butterfly. (v) We give a simpler way of deriving the topological invariants that represent the quantum Hall numbers (i.e., two Hall conductivity in 3D, σ_{xy}, σ_{zx} , in units of e^2/h).

I. INTRODUCTION

The problem of “commensurability” in almost periodic systems has been a source of fascination in various branches of physics. In this respect, the Bloch states in periodic systems in strong magnetic fields have especially appealing. Namely, the electron system with a periodic potential (or a tight-binding electron system on a lattice) in two spatial dimensions(2D) exhibits, when a uniform magnetic field is applied, a self-similar energy spectrum, known as Hofstadter’s butterfly, with fractal wave functions¹. In this case, the problem is how the Bloch electrons react to an external periodicity introduced by the magnetic field. This problem, raised more than twenty years ago by Hofstadter, has been intensively investigated.

The special assets of this problem are: (i) Mathematically, Schrödinger’s equation reduces to Harper’s equation with doubly-periodic potential, where one periodicity is externally governed by the strength of the applied magnetic field, B , so that the Bloch states are controlled *in situ* by varying B .

(ii) In Hofstadter’s butterfly (the fractal energy spectrum versus B), each Landau band splits into fractal subbands, where the integer quantum Hall effect(IQHE) is known to occur. The general argument of Laughlin² tells us that each of the fractally split bands should carry a quantized Hall current, while in usual cases each Landau band does. Thouless *et al*³ in fact have shown, by actually deriving the general formula for the quantized Hall conductance in 2D periodic system without any special assumption on the periodic potential, that the quantum

number characterizing the Hall current carried by each subband is a topological invariant.

Now, for both of (i) and (ii) above, two dimensionality is essential, since, first, Schrödinger’s equation reduces to doubly-periodic equation only in 2D (while we have a triply-periodic potential in 3D) and, second, the quantum Hall effect is usually considered to be specific to 2D. Nevertheless, we want to ask ourselves here: can we have similar phenomena that survive, or even arise specifically, in three dimensions (3D)? In the last decade several authors have indeed attempted to extend Hofstadter’s problem to 3D systems^{7,8}. Usually, however, subbands overlap in energy or touch with each other in 3D, and fractal energy spectra have not been identified. On the other hand, Halperin⁴ has shown, following the line of the analysis for 2D, that if the spectrum has an energy gap, IQHE should occur even in 3D. Montambaux and Kohmoto⁵ then proposed that 3D Bloch system in magnetic fields can realize this situation to derive the formula for Hall conductivities. These results are generalized by Kohmoto, Halperin and Wu⁶.

In our previous letter¹⁴, we have shown that an analogue of Hofstadter’s butterfly does indeed arise in an anisotropic tight-binding lattice ($t_x \gg t_y, t_z$) when a magnetic field is tilted, where the conductive axis is denoted as x . We have calculated the Hall conductivity and have shown that each of σ_{xy}, σ_{zx} , identified to be topological invariants, exhibits an integer quantum Hall effect, with a curious one-to-one correspondence with the QHE in 2D butterfly. This has been explained with a mapping between 2D and 3D. A crucial point is that the ‘3D butterfly’ is specific to three dimensionality rather than

a remnant of the 2D butterfly.

The purpose of the present paper is to address the following new points:

- (a) to obtain a ‘phase diagram’ that indicates which region in (t_y, t_z) space should exhibit the butterfly.
- (b) to show that the 3D butterfly is general enough to allow arbitrary orientation of the magnetic field.
- (c) to clarify the relation with the semiclassical quantization picture in magnetic fields in discussing the details of the 2D-3D mapping.

So the paper is organized as follows. In Sec.II, we review Harper’s equations for the 3D Bloch electrons in magnetic fields, and introduce the phase diagram of 3D butterfly. In Sec.III, we extend the 2D-3D mapping to the arbitrary orientation of the magnetic field to discuss the influence of $B_x \neq 0$ on the butterfly spectrum. In Sec.IV, we compare our results with the semiclassical approximation. In Sec.VI, we turn to QHE in the 3D butterfly, where the Hall conductivity is calculated in a much simpler way than in our earlier paper. Experimental possibilities to realize the 3D butterfly is discussed in Sec.V, and the conclusion is given in Sec.VII.

II. THE CONDITION FOR 3D BUTTERFLY

A. The 2D-3D mapping

Let us first summarize the results obtained in our previous work,¹⁴ where we first suggested that we can have a butterfly spectrum in 3D systems. We take a noninteracting tight-binding electron system in a uniform magnetic field, $\mathbf{B}$. Schrödinger’s equation is

$$-\sum_j t_{ij} e^{i\theta_{ij}} \psi_j = E \psi_i. \quad (1)$$

Here ψ_i is the wave function at site i , the summation is over nearest-neighbor sites, and $\theta_{ij} = \frac{e}{\hbar} \int_j^i \mathbf{A} \cdot d\mathbf{l}$ the Peierls phase factor arising from the magnetic flux where $\mathbf{A}$ is the vector potential with $\nabla \times \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{B}$.

We consider a 3D simple-cubic lattice in a magnetic field $\mathbf{B} = (0, B \sin \theta, B \cos \theta)$ assumed to be parallel to the yz plane. If we choose the vector potential as $\mathbf{A} = (0, Bx \cos \theta, -Bx \sin \theta)$, we can substitute ψ in eq.(1) with $\psi_{lmn} = e^{i\nu_y m + i\nu_z n} F_l$, where l, m, n are the site indexes along x, y, z , respectively. Then we have

$$-t_x(F_{l-1} + F_{l+1}) - [2t_y \cos(2\pi\phi_z l + \nu_y) + 2t_z \cos(-2\pi\phi_y l + \nu_z)]F_l = E F_l. \quad (2)$$

Here t_x, t_y, t_z are the transfer integrals between nearest neighbors along x, y, z , respectively, and ϕ_y or ϕ_z are the numbers of flux quanta penetrating the facet of the unit cell normal to y or z (Fig.1). Let us call two cosine potentials in (2) $V^{(1)}$ and $V^{(2)}$.

If we assume $\phi_y, \phi_z \ll 1$, the periods of these cosine potentials are much greater than the original lattice constant, so that the problem reduces to a continuous 1D system if we apply the effective-mass approach. One can then regard the potential minima of $V^{(1)}$ as effective ‘sites’, which we call the wells to distinguish from the original sites. Each well feels the residual potential $V^{(2)}$. If the well is deep enough, several bound states appear at each well, where each state forms a tight-binding band, which corresponds to a Landau band.

Let us define t' as the hopping between adjacent wells, where $4t'$ gives the width (Harper’s broadening) of a Landau level. Then eq.(2) reads, in terms of the wells,

$$-t'(J_{l'-1} + J_{l'+1}) - 2t_z \cos[-2\pi(\phi_y/\phi_z)l'] + (\phi_y/\phi_z)\nu_y + \nu_z J_{l'} = E J_{l'}, \quad (3)$$

where $J_{l'}$ is the amplitude at the well l' . We can see that the equation has the same form as that of the 2D system (eq.(2) with $t_z = 0$), which explains why a butterfly spectrum can appear also in 3D. If we recall that a 2D system exhibits a butterfly when isotropic ($t_x \approx t_y$), one can predict that the Landau band for which

$$t' \approx t_z \quad (4)$$

should exhibit a butterfly structure, where the value of t' varies from one Landau band to another.

B. The ‘phase diagram’ for the 3D butterfly

We have to satisfy some conditions on $(t_x, t_y, t_z, \phi_y, \phi_z)$ to have the 3D butterfly. By systematically examining them we can obtain the ‘phase diagram’, which was not obtained in our previous letter. We again assume $\phi_z, \phi_y \ll 1$, and we take $t_x = 1$ as the unit of energy.

Let us begin with the pure 2D case ($t_z = 0$), where we have only one potential term $V^{(1)}$ in Harper’s equation. If one approximates a well in $V^{(1)}$ as a harmonic potential, the energy is quantized into $\hbar\omega = 4\pi\phi_z\sqrt{t_y}$. The condition that there exist more than one levels bound to each well (i.e. Landau levels) is then $\frac{1}{2}\hbar\omega < 4t_y$ (depth of the well), i.e.,

$$\pi\phi_z < 2\sqrt{t_y}. \quad (5)$$

If the opposite inequality holds, $V^{(1)}$ has only a weak effect on the energy spectrum and wave functions.

If we turn t_z on, each Landau level feels the residual potential $V^{(2)}$ and can split into butterfly bands. For the butterfly gaps to be resolved, however, $V^{(2)}$ must be weak enough so that it does not mix different Landau levels. In other words, $4t_z$, the amplitude of $V^{(2)}$, must be smaller than $\hbar\omega = 4\pi\phi_z\sqrt{t_y}$, or

$$t_z < \pi\phi_z\sqrt{t_y}. \quad (6)$$

We can now construct the phase diagram. Since an equivalent discussion can be made when we interchange y and z , we must add the conditions

$$\pi\phi_y < 2\sqrt{t_z} \quad (7)$$

$$t_y < \pi\phi_y\sqrt{t_z}. \quad (8)$$

The resultant phase diagram is shown in Fig.2. The phase diagram consists of 1D, 2D, 3D butterfly, and 3D regions. “1D” is the region where neither eq.(5) nor eq.(7) are satisfied. There, both $V^{(1)}$ and $V^{(2)}$ are too weak and the energy spectrum can only have Bragg-reflection gaps. Since this phase is dominated by t_x , we call this 1D-like. An example, with a Bragg gap, is depicted in Fig.4. “2D-like” is the region where only one of eq.(5) or eq.(7) is satisfied. There, one of t_y or t_z has only minor effect and the spectrum is 2D-like in that we have only (Harper-broadened) Landau levels. Then we come to the “3D butterfly” phases, where eqs.(5),(6) (or eqs.(7),(8) are satisfied. The remaining region is “3D”, where all the three hoppings are too large for energy gaps to survive. Namely, even when both eq.(5) and eq.(7) are satisfied, the butterfly gaps are wiped out when the other conditions are not satisfied, i.e., when the residual potential is too large. So the 3D butterfly is allowed to appear somewhere in between the 2D and 3D phases. When the magnetic field is too small, two parabolic phase boundaries coalesce to the axes and the 3D phase becomes dominant.

We display typical energy spectrum in each phase in Fig.3. In this figure, panels (b)(c)(d) all belong to the 3D-butterfly phase, but we can immediately notice that the Landau band on which the butterfly appears varies according to where we sit on the phase diagram. This is because within this phase the 3D butterfly appears when $t' \approx t_z$ (eq.4), namely, only the Landau level (not necessarily the lowest) that has the right width exhibits the butterfly.

C. Estimate of the effective transfer integral

In our previous letter, we have numerically estimated the Landau-level broadening t' for the lowest Landau band to predict when 3D butterflies appear. Here we give a derivation of the scaling law for t' introduced there.

Consider first an electron in one dimension in the potential $V^{(1)} = -2t_y \cos(2\pi\phi_z l)$ (no $V^{(2)}$) in eq.(2). Here we have omitted the phase factor ν_y , which has no effect on t' . Our aim is to express t' as a function of (t_x, t_y, ϕ_z) . Harper’s equation in this case is

$$-t_x(F_{l-1} + F_{l+1}) - 2t_y \cos(2\pi\phi_z l)F_l = EF_l. \quad (9)$$

We have assumed the period of $V^{(1)}$ is much greater than the lattice constant, so the equation can be cast into a differential equation up to a constant,

$$-\frac{d^2 F}{dl^2} - 2t_y \cos(2\pi\phi_z l)F(l) = EF(l). \quad (10)$$

We again take $t_x = 1$ as the unit of energy. If we measure the length in the well spacing by introducing

$$\tilde{l} \equiv 2\pi\phi_z l, \quad (11)$$

the equation becomes

$$-\frac{d^2 F}{d\tilde{l}^2} - 2\frac{t_y}{(2\pi\phi_z)^2} \cos(\tilde{l})F(\tilde{l}) = \tilde{E}F(\tilde{l}), \quad (12)$$

where $\tilde{E} = E/(2\pi\phi_z)^2$ is the rescaled energy. This equation indicates that the form of the wave function depends only on t_y/ϕ_z^2 .

Since $\tilde{E}$ depends on the overlap of the neighboring wave functions and the amplitude of the periodic potential $V^{(1)}$, t' can be written as

$$t' = t_y f\left(\frac{t_y}{\phi_z^2}\right), \quad (13)$$

where the function f , which only depends on the Landau index, represents the overlap of the neighboring wave functions. Hence we have only to calculate $t'(t_y)$ for one value of ϕ_z . In the limit of large barrier between neighboring wells, $(t_y/\phi_z^2) \rightarrow \infty$, f vanishes exponentially. In the opposite limit of $(t_y/\phi_z^2) \rightarrow 0$, wells become shallow, so that the transfer to the second- (and more distant) neighbor transfers cannot be neglected, and the approximation should fail.

This argument can be used for each of the Landau levels. Higher levels have larger t' since the wave function bound in the well is more extended. So, taking account of the clear butterfly condition $t' \approx t_z$, we find that as t_z is increased the Landau level in which butterfly appears becomes higher, as we have seen in Fig.3.

III. 3D BUTTERFLY IN AN ARBITRARY ORIENTATION OF B

So far we have assumed that the magnetic field lies in the plane (yz) normal to the conductive axis. So the next question is whether we can relax this condition for realizing the butterfly. About ten years ago, several authors investigated 3D Hofstadter problem in arbitrarily oriented magnetic fields^{7,8}. They have shown that, even if each of three components of magnetic field is not zero, Schrödinger’s equation can be transformed into a one dimensional tight-binding problem with distant-neighbor hoppings. Namely, if we choose a vector potential that depends on both y and z , the equation, reduced to a 1D tight-binding equation, has n_y - and n_z -distant hoppings where $n_z/n_y = \phi_z/\phi_y$ with n_y, n_z being coprime integers. We can adopt this gauge to calculate the 3D butterfly for $B_x \neq 0$ here.

The result for the energy spectra when the magnetic field is tilted away from the yz plane ($B_x \neq 0$) is shown in Fig.5. Surprisingly, the spectrum is almost identical to that for $B_x = 0$ (Fig.5(a)). In other words, the magnetic field component parallel to the conductive direction,

which would promote the motion along that direction, has unexpectedly little effect on the 3D butterfly.

So the puzzle is: why is the 3D butterfly so robust? The tight-binding model with distant hoppings cannot be reduced to the effective 2D Harper's equation as is done here in going from eq.(2) to eq.(3), so we must take another approach.

We consider a 3D butterfly system ($t_x \gg t_y, t_z$) in a magnetic field (B_x, B_y, B_z). We take the vector potential $\mathbf{A} = (B_z y - B_y z, B_x z, 0)$, so that x is a cyclic coordinate and the wave function becomes

$$\psi_{lmn} = e^{i\nu_x l} G_{mn}, \quad (14)$$

where (l, m, n) labels (x, y, z) . Schrödinger's equation becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & -t_y(e^{i2\pi\phi_x n} G_{m-1n} + e^{-i2\pi\phi_x n} G_{m+1n}) \\ & -t_z(G_{mn-1} + G_{mn+1}) \\ & -2t_x \cos[2\pi(\phi_z m - \phi_y n) + \nu_x] G_{mn} = E G_{mn}, \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where ϕ_μ is the number of flux quanta penetrating the facet of the unit cell normal to the μ axis.

We first consider the case $B_x = 0$ ($\phi_x = 0$). This is just the case we considered in the first part of this paper, but the equation cannot be reduced to a 2D Harper's equation due to the different gauge. Nevertheless, we can derive an effective 2D Harper equation in the following manner.

In eq.(15), the assumption $t_x \gg t_y, t_z$ means the amplitude of the cosine potential, $t_x \cos[2\pi(\phi_z m - \phi_y n) + \nu_x]$, is much greater than the hopping terms along y, z (first two terms in eq.(15)). So the states are basically bound to a 'trough' of the cosine potential. In this sense, the state is quasi-one-dimensional. So let us derive an effective Schrödinger's equation within the trough.

If we switch off t_z for the moment, the set of equations for different n 's are decoupled to give

$$\begin{aligned} & -t_y(G_{m-1n}^0 + G_{m+1n}^0) \\ & -2t_x \cos[2\pi(\phi_z m - \phi_y n) + \nu_x] G_{mn}^0 = E_n^0 G_{mn}^0, \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

This is an equation for one variable $m \parallel y$, and the eigenstates are bound states in a cosine potential. If t_z is turned on, the states having different values of $n \parallel z$ are mixed to form a tight-binding band (Fig.6). The band width is proportional to t_z times the overlap, α , between neighboring bound states having a slightly different center positions. The equation can now be reduced to

$$-\alpha t_z (J_{n-1} + J_{n+1}) + E_n^0 J_n = E J_n, \quad (17)$$

where J_n is the amplitude of the bound states at n . The binding energy E_n^0 in eq.(16) depends on n , since the set of values of a steep cosine potential at discrete points have a discommensuration that is periodic in n with a period ϕ_z/ϕ_y (i.e., $n \rightarrow n + \phi_z/\phi_y$ in eq.(16) is equivalent to $m \rightarrow m - 1$). We can check by the numerical

calculation that the E_n^0 can be approximated with a cosine function, whose amplitude is denoted by t' . Thus, the equation (17) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & -\alpha t_z (J_{n-1} + J_{n+1}) \\ & -2t' \cos[2\pi(\phi_y/\phi_z)n + \text{const.}] J_n = E J_n. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

This is the effective Harper equation in this approach. This equation has the same set of eigenvalues as those of eq.(3) as it should.

If we assume $\alpha = 1$ ($\phi_y \ll \phi_z$), we can prove that t' in eqs.(18) and (3) are identical. In fact, eq. (18) has the same form as eq.(3) except that t' and t_z are exchanged. In the 2D Harper equation, exchanging the two hoppings does not change the energy spectrum because of the gauge invariance, which concludes the proof.

The new effective equation can easily be extended to the arbitrarily oriented magnetic fields. If B_x is turned on, the bound states in a trough feel a magnetic field B_x parallel to the yz plane. If the state were purely one-dimensional, it would not be affected by magnetic fields. So the problem is to what extent we can neglect the effect of B_x on the quasi-one-dimensional state. We assume $\phi_y \ll \phi_z$ ($\theta \approx 0$) again. If one considers the state having an energy E above the bottom, the width of the wave function can be estimated as $\sqrt{E/t_x}/\phi_z$, while the length scale over which the Peierls phase due to B_x changes is $1/\phi_x$. Thus we can say B_x has a minor effect on the 3D butterfly when

$$\sqrt{\frac{E}{t_x}} < \frac{\phi_z}{\phi_x}. \quad (19)$$

In the opposite limit, $\phi_y \gg \phi_z$ ($\theta \approx 90^\circ$), we have only to replace ϕ_z with ϕ_y in the inequality. In our example above, the condition, for the lowest Landau band, becomes $\phi_x < 3\phi_z$ ($\theta \approx 0^\circ$), $\phi_x < 3\phi_y$ ($\theta \approx 90^\circ$), which is indeed satisfied in Fig.5.

IV. RELATION TO THE SEMICLASSICAL PICTURE

The semiclassical picture is often employed in examining the motion of electrons in magnetic field. So this section addresses the question of whether or not the present approach in terms of Harper's equation can be interpreted in the semiclassical approach. We shall conclude that the semiclassical approach *cannot* describe the butterfly physics.

In the semiclassical approximation, an electron in k -space moves along the intersection of the equienergy surface with a plane perpendicular to $\mathbf{B}$. If the orbit closes in k -space, we may apply Bohr-Sommerfeld's quantization condition,

$$\oint \mathbf{k}_\perp \times d\mathbf{k}_\perp = \frac{2\pi}{\ell_B^2} n, \quad (20)$$

which requires that the area enclosed by the orbit must be a multiple of $2\pi/\ell_B^2$, where $\ell_B = \sqrt{\hbar/eB}$ is the magnetic length.

On the other hand, in Harper's equation, the binding in wells gives the quantized states. Let us start with identifying the correspondence between two quantizations, which look different at first sight. In the following, we again assume the conditions $\phi_y, \phi_z \ll 1, t_y \phi_z \gg t_z \phi_y$, which are our starting point in deriving the effective Harper equation.

The energy dispersion, in the absence of magnetic fields, is

$$E(\mathbf{k}) = -2t_x \cos k_x a - 2t_y \cos k_y b - 2t_z \cos k_z c, \quad (21)$$

where a, b, c are the lattice constants along x, y, z , respectively. First we consider a semiclassical orbit around Γ point, around which $E(\mathbf{k})$ can be approximated, up to a constant, as

$$E(\mathbf{k}) = t_x(k_x a)^2 + t_y(k_y b)^2 + t_z(k_z c)^2. \quad (22)$$

An equienergy surface is then represented by an ellipsoid. For $\mathbf{B}$ tilted by an angle θ from z axis, the area enclosed by the orbit around Γ having an energy E is

$$S = \frac{\pi E}{\cos \theta \sqrt{t_x a^2 (t_y b^2 + t_z c^2 \tan^2 \theta)}}. \quad (23)$$

Applying the quantization condition, we obtain the quantized energy,

$$E_n = 4\pi n \sqrt{t_x (t_y \phi_z^2 + t_z \phi_y^2)}. \quad (24)$$

Around the X point, $(k_x, k_y, k_z) = (0, 0, \pi/c)$ on the edge of the Brillouin zone, on the other hand, $E(\mathbf{k})$ can be approximated as

$$E(\mathbf{k}) = t_x(k_x a)^2 + t_y(k_y b)^2 - t_z(\pi - k_z c)^2. \quad (25)$$

This time the equienergy surface is hyperbolic along z , while elliptic along x, y . The area of an orbit encircling X is

$$S = \frac{\pi E}{\cos \theta \sqrt{t_x a^2 (t_y b^2 - t_z c^2 \tan^2 \theta)}}, \quad (26)$$

and the quantized energy is

$$E_n = 4\pi n \sqrt{t_x (t_y \phi_z^2 - t_z \phi_y^2)}. \quad (27)$$

What corresponds to the quantized energy (24) or (27) in Harper's equation? The potential in Harper's equation consists of two periodic terms,

$$\begin{aligned} V^{(1)}(l) &= -2t_y \cos(2\pi \phi_z l + \nu_y), \\ V^{(2)}(l) &= -2t_z \cos(-2\pi \phi_y l + \nu_z). \end{aligned}$$

As discussed above, if the condition $t_y \phi_z \gg t_z \phi_y$ is satisfied, $V^{(1)}$ is responsible for potential peaks and dips while

$V^{(2)}$ provides a slowly varying part. The energy quanta are determined by the curvature of the wells. While the curvature depends mainly on $V^{(1)}$, $V^{(2)}$ also gives an additional contribution. Let us consider the well around a minimum of $V^{(2)}$. We can express the bottom of the well in a harmonic form,

$$V^{(1)}(l) + V^{(2)}(l) = t_y(2\pi \phi_z l)^2 + t_z(2\pi \phi_y l)^2. \quad (28)$$

The energy quantum is then given by

$$\hbar\omega_c = 4\pi \sqrt{t_x a^2 (t_y \phi_z^2 + t_z \phi_y^2)}, \quad (29)$$

which is identical with eq.(24). Around a maximum of $V^{(2)}$, the potential is written as

$$V^{(1)}(l) + V^{(2)}(l) = t_y(2\pi \phi_z l)^2 - t_z(2\pi \phi_y l)^2. \quad (30)$$

Note that $V^{(1)}$ and $V^{(2)}$ have the opposite curvatures in this case. The energy quantum is

$$\hbar\omega_c = 4\pi \sqrt{t_x a^2 (t_y \phi_z^2 - t_z \phi_y^2)}, \quad (31)$$

which is identical with eq.(27).

These indicate that a semiclassical orbit in k -space translates to a bound state in a well. In Harper's equation, however, a bound state of one well is not an eigenstate but hops to adjacent wells, i.e., bound states in different wells are mixed, which is exactly why each Landau level is broadened by the hopping t' . We have seen that this effect is essential in explaining the butterfly structure. Hence we can conclude that the butterfly is *outside* the semiclassical description.

V. THE HALL CONDUCTIVITY

Once the spectrum with a recursive set of energy gaps are obtained, a most important question is whether an integer quantum Hall effect exists on that spectrum. Montambaux and Kohmoto have first obtained the quantized Hall conductance for three dimensional tight-binding electrons in magnetic fields following the line of the results for the 2D case⁵. In this section, we derive, following their arguments, the systematics in the Hall conductivity for the 3D butterfly spectrum. Although the results are the same as in our earlier paper, we have greatly simplified the derivation.

Let us go back to Harper's equation (2) for the simple cubic lattice in rational magnetic fluxes $(\phi_x, \phi_y, \phi_z) = (0, p_y/q_y, p_z/q_z)$. When $\phi_z, \phi_y \ll 1$, we can adopt the effective-mass approach for the lattice structure along x , and the equation reduces to a differential form,

$$\begin{aligned} E_x(-i\partial_x)F(x) - [2t_y \cos(G_z x + k_y b) + \\ 2t_z \cos(-G_y x + k_z c)]F(x) = EF(x), \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where

$$G_z = 2\pi\phi_z/a, \quad G_y = 2\pi\phi_y/a, \quad (33)$$

and $E_x(k_x)$ is the dispersion along x axis. Now the equation is doubly periodic just as in 2D. If we assume $\phi_z/\phi_y = p/q$ (p, q :integers), we end up with a Diophantine equation for the r -th gap,

$$r = sq + tp, \quad (34)$$

where s, t are topologically invariant integers, constant in each gap. Thus, the number of states per unit volume below the r th gap is

$$\frac{sG_z + tG_y}{2\pi/L_x} \frac{2\pi/b}{2\pi/L_y} \frac{2\pi/c}{2\pi/L_z} \frac{1}{V} = \frac{sG_z + tG_y}{2\pi bc}, \quad (35)$$

where $V = L_x L_y L_z$ is the total volume of the system.

According to the Widom-Středa formula^{9,10}, the Hall conductivity when the Fermi level is in a gap is written as

$$\sigma_{ij} = -e \sum_k \epsilon_{ijk} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial B_k}, \quad (36)$$

where ρ is the density of electrons for a fixed chemical potential and ϵ_{ijk} is the unit antisymmetric tensor. Substituting eq.(35) for ρ , we finally obtain

$$(\sigma_{xy}, \sigma_{zx}) = \frac{e^2}{h} \left(\frac{s}{c}, \frac{t}{b} \right). \quad (37)$$

This is the explicit formula for the Hall conductivity derived from Montambaux-Kohmoto's argument. We can then calculate the Hall conductivity for an arbitrary gap in the 3D butterfly. The result for the Hall conductivity is shown in Fig.8(a) for the spectrum displayed in Fig.5(a).

If we compare this with the corresponding plot for 2D in Fig.8(b), we can see that there exists a beautiful correspondence between 2D and 3D cases: σ_{zx} in 3D corresponds to σ_{2D} in 2D. The mapping between 2D and 3D Harper equations explains this in a transparent manner. Let us consider the Fermi level lying in the r' th butterfly gap in the N th Landau level in the 3D butterfly. Since one Landau band is composed of q butterfly bands, the total gap number r from the bottom is $r = Nq + r'$. The Diophantine equation (34) then reads

$$r' = (s - N)q + tp. \quad (38)$$

On the other hand, according to the argument by Thouless et al³, the Hall conductivity in 2D for the flux p_{2D}/q_{2D} is given by

$$\sigma_{2D} = -\frac{e^2}{h} t_{2D}, \quad (39)$$

where t_{2D} is an integer given by the Diophantine equation for the r_{2D} th gap,

$$r_{2D} = s_{2D}q_{2D} + t_{2D}p_{2D}. \quad (40)$$

Recalling the 2D-3D mapping, we can establish a correspondence

$$\begin{aligned} p &\longleftrightarrow p_{2D}, \\ q &\longleftrightarrow q_{2D}, \\ r' &\longleftrightarrow r_{2D}. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

Namely, the correspondence between the topological invariants reads

$$s - N \longleftrightarrow s_{2D}, \quad (42)$$

$$t \longleftrightarrow t_{2D}. \quad (43)$$

This relation explains the correspondence between σ_{zx} in 3D and σ_{2D} in 2D as displayed in the Fig.8.

We can ask how the Hall conductivities vary when the magnetic field is tilted away from the yz plane (with $B_x \neq 0$). As shown in the Sec.III, B_x preserves the butterfly structure unless its magnitude is too large. This implies that the Hall conductivities, being topological invariants, are not affected by the tilting.

VI. POSSIBLE EXPERIMENTAL REALIZATIONS

Let us comment on the possibility of observing the 3D butterfly in real materials. In the 2D case, the magnetic flux ϕ required for the butterfly is the order of unity, that is, $B \approx \frac{1}{a^2} \frac{h}{e}$. If one assumes an atomic lattice constant $a = 2\text{\AA}$, $B \sim O(10^5)\text{T}$, which is obviously too huge. In the 3D case on the other hand, Fig.2 shows that there exists appropriate (t_y, t_z) for the 3D butterfly no matter how small ϕ_y, ϕ_z may be. So, for a given lattice constant, the butterfly is more easily realized in 3D.

In practice, appropriate (t_y, t_z) become small for small values of the fluxes. The energy scale then shrinks when the magnetic field is small, so that it will become harder to resolve the butterfly structure. For typical quasi-1D organic conductors such as $(\text{TMTSF})_2\text{X}^{15}$ we have $t_x : t_y : t_z \sim 1 : 0.1 : 0.01$ with $a, b, c \sim 10\text{\AA}$, and we can estimate the required magnetic field to be

$$\phi_z \gtrsim 0.01,$$

which is *two* orders of magnitude smaller than the 2D counterpart, $\phi_z \sim 1$. $\phi_z = 0.01$ corresponds to $B = 40\text{T}$, which is well within the experimental feasibility. The energy scale (the required energy resolution) is $4(t' + t_z) \sim 10\text{ meV}$. In our earlier paper,¹⁴ we have focused on the lowest Landau level in estimating the required field for the butterfly, which required a much larger flux ($\phi_z = 0.1$). So the important message here is that, if we employ higher Landau levels, the condition is drastically relaxed, since the higher levels have larger Harper-broadening.

The electron-electron interaction, ignored here, can be significant in real materials. Although it may first seem that the interaction would smear out the butterfly, we can show that it can rather give rise to the butterfly. For an organic metal (TMTSF)₂X, it has been known that the many-body interaction causes a spin density wave to become stable in strong magnetic fields, which is called the field-induced spin density wave (FISDW)¹¹. There, an energy gap opens across the SDW nesting wave vector on the Fermi surface, and the hoppings t_y and t_z give rise to series of gaps for electron and hole bands around the SDW gap^{12,13}. In (TMTSF)₂X where $t_x : t_y : t_z \sim 1 : 0.1 : 0.01$, t_z happens to be too small to play a role, so that the spectrum is 2D-like, i.e., has only Landau levels around the main gap. We can then propose that, if there are quasi-1D materials that have $t_y \approx t_z$ (rather than $t_y \gg t_z$), the spectrum is expected to have 3D butterfly gaps according to the present theory. This mechanism is interesting, since the butterfly formation, being SDW related, is around E_F by construction. The detail will be published elsewhere.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

We have investigated the energy spectra and quantum Hall effects in anisotropic three-dimensional Bloch electrons in magnetic fields. We have (i) obtained a phase diagram versus (t_y, t_z) to identify the region in which the butterfly appears. (ii) We have extended our theory to the arbitrary orientation of $\mathbf{B}$, and proved that a change in the orientation has surprisingly little effect on the 3D butterfly. (iii) We have discussed the relation between our method and the semiclassical approach, and found that while there is a clear correspondence in Landau's quantization, the butterfly structure is beyond the semiclassical picture. (iv) The required magnetic field for a representative organic metal (TMTSF compound) is estimated to be modest (~ 40 T) if we adopt higher Landau levels for the butterfly. (v) We have finally given a simpler way of deriving the topological invariants that represent the quantum Hall numbers (i.e., two Hall conductivity in 3D, σ_{xy}, σ_{zx} , in units of e^2/h).

M.K. would like to thank the JSPS Research Fellowships for Young Scientists for financial support.

FIG. 1. The geometry in a 3D lattice in a tilted magnetic field.

FIG. 2. The phase diagram that indicates the character of the energy spectrum in anisotropic 3D systems ($t_y, t_z \ll t_x = 1$) against t_y and t_z for the given values of the magnetic fluxes ϕ_y, ϕ_z as defined in Fig.1. The 3D butterfly region is shaded.

FIG. 3. Typical energy spectra plotted against $\tan\theta$ for various positions in the phase diagram (indicated on Fig.2 as (a)-(e)). Here we have fixed $V^{(1)}$ ($t_y = 0.5, \phi_z = 1/10$) to vary t_z/ϕ_y^2 . We can see that the butterfly region shifts upward as t_z is increased, which confirms the above observation since the width of the Landau band is larger for higher Landau bands.

FIG. 4. Typical 1D-like energy spectrum for $t_x : t_y : t_z = 1 : 0.01 : 0.01$ plotted against θ in magnetic fields $(\phi_y, \phi_z) = 1/5(\sin\theta, \cos\theta)$. The gaps are due to Bragg's reflection by $V^{(1)}$ and $V^{(2)}$.

FIG. 5. The energy spectra of the 3D system $t_x : t_y : t_z = 1 : 0.1 : 0.1$ plotted against the tilting angle θ in a magnetic field $\sqrt{\phi_y^2 + \phi_z^2} = 1/5$ for various tilting orientations of $\mathbf{B}$ (as depicted in the inset).

FIG. 6. The potential and wave functions along y are schematically depicted for eq.(17). The grayscale represents the value of the potential. The eigenstates bound at different positions in the trough are mixed by t_z .

FIG. 7. Semiclassical electron orbits in k -space are schematically shown. We have assumed $t_x > t_y > t_z$.

FIG. 8. (a) Hall conductivities $(\sigma_{xy}, \sigma_{zx}) = -(e^2/h)(s, t)$ are plotted on a 3D butterfly, where we display the topological invariants (s, t) for each gap. (b) The corresponding plot for $\sigma_{2D} = -(e^2/h)t_{2D}$ on the 2D butterfly. The region enclosed by a dashed line in (a) corresponds to the 2D butterfly, where t in (a) corresponds to t_{2D} in (b), while s in (a) to s_{2D} in Eq.(43)

¹ D. R. Hofstadter, Phys. Rev. B **14**, 2239 (1976).

² R. B. Laughlin, Phys. Rev. B **23**, 5632 (1981).

³ D. J. Thouless, M. Kohmoto, P. Nightingale, and M. den Nijs, Phys. Rev. Lett **49**, 405 (1982).

⁴ B. I. Halperin, Jpn. J. Appl. Phys. Suppl. **26**, 1913 (1987).

⁵ G. Montambaux and M. Kohmoto, Phys. Rev. B **41**, 11417 (1990).

⁶ M. Kohmoto, B. I. Halperin, and Y. Wu, Phys. Rev. B **45**, 13488 (1992).

⁷ Y. Hasegawa, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **59**, 4384 (1990).

⁸ Z. Kunst and A. Zee, Phys. Rev. B **44**, 6842 (1991).

⁹ A. Widom, Phys. Lett. **90A**, 474 (1982).

¹⁰ P. Štředa, J. Phys. C **15**, L718 (1982).

¹¹ L. P. Gor'kov, and A. G. Lebed', J. Phys. Lett **45**, L433 (1984).

¹² D. Poilblanc, M. Héritier, G. Montambaux and P. Lederer,

- J. Phys. C **19**, L321 (1986).
- ¹³ K. Maki, Phys Rev. B **33**, 4826 (1986).
- ¹⁴ M. Koshino, H. Aoki, K. Kuroki, S. Kagoshima and T. Osada, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 1062 (2001).
- ¹⁵ T. Ishiguro, K. Yamaji and G. Saito *Organic Superconductors* (Springer, 1997).

This figure "FIG1.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/cond-mat/0110206v1>

This figure "FIG2.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/cond-mat/0110206v1>

This figure "FIG3.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/cond-mat/0110206v1>

This figure "FIG4.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/cond-mat/0110206v1>

This figure "FIG5.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/cond-mat/0110206v1>

This figure "FIG6.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/cond-mat/0110206v1>

This figure "FIG7.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/cond-mat/0110206v1>

This figure "FIG8.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/cond-mat/0110206v1>